

REMARKS:

In the Office Action mailed January 25, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-27. An Amendment was filed on June 9, 2006.

In response to the Amendment filed on June 9, 2006, the Examiner issued an Advisory Action (mailed June 20, 2006) indicating that the June 9, 2006 Amendment will not be entered because the amendments therein raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

A Request for Consideration is submitted herewith to have the June 9, 2006 Amendment entered and considered. Further, new claim 28 is added herein. No new matter is presented. Thus, claims 1-28 are pending and under consideration.

For convenience of the Examiner, the June 9, 2006 Amendment is reproduced and patentability of new claim 28 is addressed herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,498,791(Pickett) and U.S. Patent No. 6,681,257 (Patel).

Pickett updates subscriber information used by voice and data systems connected to a communications system in a particular environment. For example, in the event of a subscriber directory change within the particular environment, the communications system (50) may broadcast updated subscriber directory information to all computers coupled to communications system (50) to make the change or send an e-mail to the computers coupled to communications system (50) prompting the users to accept/reject the subscriber directory update (see, col. 17, line 57 through col. 18, line 5).

The Examiner relies on Patel as teaching use of different autonomous telephony messaging systems. However, Patel is directed to identifying a mailbox address for use in delivery of a message based on an entry or a record including routing information created in a voice mail system (VMS) for a subscriber based on a region-wide messaging directory (RMD) for directory look-up (see, col. 7, lines 15-41).

The present invention implements a change across all telephony messaging systems upon determining that a predetermined event such as renaming a mailbox, creation of a new mailbox, etc., has occurred.

Independent claim 1 as amended recites, "generating an update request in response to an event that changes subscriber information" based on "a determination that said event is one of predetermined events requiring an update across the telephony messaging systems." Independent claims 23, 24 and 26 recite similar features.

Independent claim 7 also recites generating an update request based on a determination that one of the subscriber actions and the administrator actions matches predetermined events requiring an update across the voice messaging systems", "reading the update requests from the queue on a first-in first-out basis" and "updating the shared subscriber directory server in real-time based on the update request."

Independent claim 22 recites, "generating, responsive to a subscriber telephone call, an update request for updating" based on "a determination that one of the subscriber actions and the administrator actions matches predetermined events requiring an update across the voice messaging system" and "appending, the update request to a queue managed by an update server and in a same order as one of corresponding subscriber actions and corresponding administrator actions occur." Independent claim 25 also recites similar features.

Claim 22 further recites, "refreshing, with the update server, subscriber information in the update requests, after said reading and before said sending" and "sending the update requests from the update server to the shared subscriber directory server using Lightweight Directory Access Protocol."

On page 12 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner asserts that claim 27 is rejected based on the same rationale used for rejecting the other independent claims. However, claim 27 recites, "automatically updating subscriber information of corresponding subscriber databases of the telephony messaging systems and the shared subscriber directory" in response to a change event at "any one of the telephony messaging systems." Claim 27 further, recites, "synchronizing corresponding routing directories of each of the telephony messaging systems", where the "telephony messages systems are maintained by multiple vendors."

Pickett and Patel, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-identified features of the claims including generating an update request based on "a determination" that

actions or events match “predetermined events” (claims 1, 7 and 22-26) and in response to an event at “any one of the telephony messaging systems... maintained by multiple vendors” (claim 27).

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over Pickett and Patel.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claim 8, the present invention includes “refreshing subscriber information in the update requests... in accordance with current corresponding subscriber information in the voice messaging system, when the update requests are one of expired and in a queue not primarily associated with the voice messaging system having the subscriber information”. The cited references do not teach or suggest these features of dependent claim 8.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM:

New claim 28 is added herein to recite, “receiving a request for changing subscriber information from a corresponding subscriber, said subscriber information being stored in a shared directory used by a first of the messaging systems.” Claim 28 further recites, “updating the subscriber information across each of the telephony messaging systems” and “routing a message to a second of the telephony systems using the updated subscriber information.”

Pickett and Patel do not teach or suggest the features of claim 28 including storing subscriber information “in a shared directory used by a first of the messaging systems”, “updating across each of the telephony messaging systems” and “routing a message to a second of the telephony systems using the updated subscriber information”, as recited in claim 28.

Thus, claim 28 is patentably distinguishable over Pickett and Patel.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 06/26/2006

By: 
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501